

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT WINCHESTER**

ISSAC S. KNOTT,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No.: 4:21-CV-33-CLC-SKL
)	
KEVIN MARTIN,)	
SHANE GEORGE,)	
JOHN LASATER, and)	
S.A. DAUGHERTY,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>		
ISAAC S. KNOTT,)	
)	<i>Lead Case Consolidated with</i>
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No.: 4:21-CV-40-CLC-SKL
)	
SHANE GEORGE,)	
KEVIN MARTIN,)	
2 OTHER UNKNOWN OFFICERS,)	
STEVEN DAUGHTERY, and)	
JOHN LASATER,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

Defendants Shane George, Kevin Martin, Steven Daugherty, and John Lasater have moved for dismissal of certain claims against them in this consolidated pro se prisoner's civil rights action for violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 [Doc. 9]. Plaintiff has not filed a response to the motion, and the deadline to do so has passed. *See* E.D. Tenn. L.R. 7.1.

By way of history, the Court notes that Plaintiff, an inmate housed at the Bedford County Correctional Facility, filed similar pro se complaints in this Court and in the Bedford County

Circuit Court alleging violations of his rights under the United States Constitution [*See* Doc. 2 in No. 4:21-CV-33; Doc. 1-1 in No. 4:21-CV-40]. This Court screened Plaintiff's § 1983 complaint in accordance with the Prison Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA"), and, as relevant here, it dismissed all claims against Defendants George, Martin, Daughtery, and Lasater in their official capacities; dismissed Plaintiff's equal protection claim; and dismissed Plaintiff's claim relating to the loss of approximately \$800 [*See, generally*, Doc. 4].

Subsequently, Defendants removed the Bedford County Circuit Court action to this Court and moved for the dismissal of those claims this Court dismissed in its PLRA screening order of the § 1983 Complaint [*See* Docs. 8 and 9]. The Court ordered the cases consolidated [Doc. 8].

This Court has already determined that Plaintiff cannot sustain official capacity, equal protection, or loss of property claims against Defendants [Doc. 4], and therefore, Defendants' motion to dismiss these claims from the removed action [Doc. 9] — to the extent any such motion is necessary after the Court's consolidation of these matters — is **GRANTED** for the same reasons the Court dismissed those claims in its screening order [Doc. 4].

SO ORDERED.

ENTER:

/s/
CURTIS L. COLLIER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE